Of

## WITNESSES

| Defense' Witnesses                 | Page  |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| TANAKA, Ryukichi (resumed)         | 22957 |
| Cross (cont'd) by General Vasiliev | 22957 |
| Pedirect by Mr. Furness            | 22967 |
| (Witness excused)                  | 22968 |
| YANO, Mitsuji                      | 22978 |
| Direct by Mr. Blakeney             | 22978 |
| MORNING RECESS                     | 22979 |
| RECESS                             | 22986 |
| NOON RECESS                        | 22987 |
| Direct (cont'd) by Er. Blakeney    | 22988 |
| (Witness excused)                  | 23005 |
| HATTORI, Takushiro                 | 23010 |
| Direct by Mr. Blakeney             | 23011 |
| AFTERNOON RECESS                   | 23020 |
| Direct by Mr. Blakeney (cont'd)    | 23021 |
| (Witness excused)                  | 23022 |

Of

WITNESSES

(cont'd)

| Defense' witnesses       | Page  |
|--------------------------|-------|
| OGISU, Rippei            | 23025 |
| Direct by Mr. Blakeney   | 23025 |
| Cross by Colonel Smirnov | 23037 |

Of

## EXHIBITS

| Doc.   | Def. | Pros. | Description                                                                                                            | For Ident.  | In<br>Evidence |
|--------|------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| None   | 2648 |       | Book (in Japanese) entitled "Reference on Tactical Activities"                                                         | 22966       |                |
| 1576   | 2649 |       | Excerpt from "Treaties Between China and England, .merica, France and Russia" Treaty Bureau, Fore Ministry (pp.2292-23 | ign<br>294) | 22975          |
| 1601   | 2650 |       | Affidavit of YANO,<br>Mitsuji                                                                                          |             | 22993          |
| None   | 2651 |       | Book entitled "History<br>of Nomadic Life in<br>Mongolia"                                                              | 22999       |                |
| None   | 2652 |       | Book entitled "Holom-<br>bair"                                                                                         | 23000       |                |
| 1601-C | 2653 |       | Japanese General Staff<br>Office Map of Easte<br>Asia                                                                  | rn<br>23000 |                |
| None   | 2654 |       | Book entitled "Mongolia<br>Topography"                                                                                 | an<br>23002 |                |
| 1604   | 2655 |       | Affidavit of HATTORI, Takushire                                                                                        |             | 23014          |
| 1376   | 2656 |       | Affidavit of CGISU,<br>Rippei                                                                                          |             | 23029          |

Of

## EXHIBITS

| Doc.   | Def. | Pros. | Description                                                                                                            | For Ident.  | In<br>Evidence |
|--------|------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| None   | 2648 |       | Book (in Japanese) entitled "Reference on Tactical Activities"                                                         | 22966       |                |
| 1576   | 2649 |       | Excerpt from "Treaties Between China and England, .merica, France and Russia" Treaty Bureau, Fore Ministry (pp.2292-22 | ign<br>294) | 22975          |
| 1601   | 2650 |       | Affidavit of YANO,<br>Mitsuji                                                                                          |             | 22993          |
| None   | 2651 |       | Book entitled "History<br>of Nomadic Life in<br>Mongolia"                                                              | 22999       |                |
| None   | 2652 |       | Book entitled "Holom-<br>bair"                                                                                         | 23000       |                |
| 1601-C | 2653 |       | Japanese General Staff<br>Office Map of Easter<br>Asia                                                                 | rn<br>23000 |                |
| None   | 2654 |       | Book entitled "Mongolis<br>Topography"                                                                                 | an<br>23002 |                |
| 1604   | 2655 |       | Affidavit of HATTORI, Takushire                                                                                        |             | 23014          |
| 1376   | 2656 |       | Affidavit of OGISU, Rippei                                                                                             |             | 23029          |

1 Monday, 26 May 1947 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: 12 For the Tribunal, same as before with the 13 exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE NORTHCROFT, Member 14 from New Zealand and HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, 15 Member from the Republic of China, now sitting. 16 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 19 (English to Japanese and Japanese 20 to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.) 21 22 23 24 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session. THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

IR. FURNISS: I think the witness TANAKA was on the stand at the time the session ended on Friday. He is in the witness room.

THY PRISIDENT: It has been pointed out tom that comies of exhibit 2175 have not yet been distributed among the Judges. That must be done forthwith.

MR. FURNISS: That, of course, your Honor, is a document introduced by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: I am oware of that.

RYUKUCHI TANAKA, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

#### CROSS-EXAMINATION

GFNERAL VASILIEV: First I went to clear up the matter concerning exhibit 2175. I have already explained to the Honorable Tribunal that this exhibit is absolutely identical with exhibit 753 with only one difference, that this exhibit is a full man -- full scale map. Then this map was produced there was no wish on the part of the defense and on the part of the Honorable Tribunal to obtain a copy of this exhibit.

11 12

10

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

14

15

13

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

I now take measures that in a few days these copies be processed and served upon the defense and the honorable Members of the Tribunal.

May I continue my cross-examination? THE PRESIDENT: You may.

BY GENERAL VASILIEV (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, on Friday you testified that according to the established practice in the Jananese Army, a cross sign meant the place at which clash between troops occurred, is that so?

THE PRESIDENT: He said it was.

A I didn't say combat area. I did not say so.

I said it was a sign indicating the point of clash
between two forces.

THE PRESIDENT: Obviously what the General said was misinterpreted to him.

Q I ask you to look through this book and later we shall speak with you about this book.

(Whereupon, a book was handed to the witness.)

TR. FURNISS: If the Court please, I ask that the book be marked for identification.

THE PRISIDENT: I said that can be done at any time convenient to the prosecutor or the person handing the book to the witness.

1 2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

20

21

23

24

25

with your enswer later.

0 Read its title please. 1 2 "Reference on Technical Activities." 3 Maybe I haven't heard the title correctly. 4 It is "Practical Instructions on Tactics," isn't that 5 so? 6 MR. FURNESS: Your Honor, I object for obvious 7 reasons. 8 THI PRESIDENT: Why this waste of time about 9 this simple matter of handing a book to the witness 10 and asking him what it is and what its contents are 11 and whether he agrees or disagrees with any of them? 12 That is done every day and no time is wasted. 13 Q I ask you to confirm that this book is 14 "Practical Instructions upon Tactics" designed for the 15 Japanese Army. 16 A I do not confirm that. 17 THI PRESIDENT: That is the end of it. 18 Q Then what is this book? What is its title? 19 This is a non-ruthoritative book published 20 by some book publisher to sell in the city book shops 21 to make money. It is a purely civilian enterprise and 22 has no suthoritative value. It is not a text book. 23 Q You did not enswer my question. We will deal

Now will you first tell me what is the title

of this book? Read its title in Japanese, please. 1 A Sakusen Sagyo No Sanko. 2 THE PRISIDENT: We want to know in English 3 what the witness said in Japanese. 4 THE INTERPRETER: "References on Tactical 5 Practices or Activities." 6 In what year was this book published? 7 January 31, 1942 -- January 30. 8 They gave me two translations of your answer --9 two years of the publish of this book, 1930 and 1942. 10 Which one is the correct one? 11 It is Shows 17, so that would be 1942. 12 Q Who is the author of the book, or who commiled 13 this book? 14 A The name of the editor, publisher and printer 15 is stated as MATDA, Iwataro. 16 It is said there that this book was compiled 17 by the Society for the Study of Military Science, was not it so? Look at the book attentively. 19 A On the title it says "Society for the Study 20 of Military Science," or something of that nature, but 21 the party legally responsible for the publication of 22 this book is MAEDA, Iwetero who is given as the editor, 24 publisher and printer. Q Thus the book was compiled by the Society for 25

25

point."

A

the Study of Military Science. Tell me, is it indicated 1 in the book that it was taken from the Imperial Japanese Library? 3 A Legally speaking, I still insist that the 4 responsible party is MATDA, Iwatero, but in as much 5 as the seal of the Imperial Library is affixed to this 6 book I recognize that it was brought from that library. Q Look at page 653. Does this page contain 8 any cross sign in the nature of X? Is there any such sign there? 10 A Yes, I notice it. 11 Read what is the explanation given for this 12 sign. 13 Section of destruction of constructed matter 14 such as railways and bridges. Also the cutting down of 15 trees. That is the section for the cutting down of 16 trees. Supply point other than --17 THE INTERPRETER: Delete the last portion. 18 Look at page 660. Is there the same cross 19 sign there for this page? 20 A Yes. 21 Read what it means. 22 Q 23 It says, "Point of supply other than main sup"ly

We couldn't find any other sign of X or cross

sign in the whole list of signs. Look for yourself. Maybe you will have better luck than we had.

Haven't you found it?

A I do not place any credibility in a book published by some book keeper or book publisher in the čity.

Q I did not ask you that.

A I have more to say on that point.

Q Witness, it is for the Tribunal to decide whether the book has importance or not. You must enswer my question.

I should like to avoid trying to read this book which is more than 600 pages long. It would take considerable time of the Court.

Lest Friday I testified that the point of clash of two opposing troops was indicated by the crossing of two swords, a cross mark made with two swords with the scabbard on. And then I added that in order to simplify the sign the scabbard was removed and the simple cross sign was used. I should like to have you recall that. I should also like to have you recall that I said that this was a long established practice. This book does not include all of the various signs and markings used.

This is also a book published by a non-responsible

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15 16

17

19

20

21

23

24

irresponsible city book show. I should like to avoid referring to an irresponsible book of this kind before a tribunal which places the utmost emphasis on truth and accuracy.

.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have said enough about the book and your opinion of it for the time being.

Q May the witness be shown exhibit 2642 which is a sketch map of the Lake Khasan area made in hand or made by hand -- exhibit 2642? I gave you my copy served upon me by the defense.

(Whereupon, a mrp was handed to the witness.)

MR. FURNESS: If your Honor please, I would like to have him shown the exhibit itself or a photostatic copy, and I don't think that is a photostatic copy which he has in his hand.

THE PRESIDENT: We should have exhibit 2462.

Mr. Lynch, you have that exhibit. You have every exhibit, or you should have.

The clark of the court received no notice that it would be required this morning and that is shy it is not in court.

Q Mr. Witness, maybe you remember that looking at this exhibit you testified that according to the

sketch men the border line preses not along the summit of the northern hill but slong the foot of this hill.

THE PRESIDENT: "cll, weit until the original is evailable.

#### A Which map?

THE PRISIDENT: Do not enswer yet until the map about which you are being exam ned is placed before you, being the mep now in evidence.

> THE 'ITM SS: Yes, I shall weit. (Whereupon, a map was handed to the

witness.)

I report my question. The border line es shown on this sketch map passes not along the summit of the northern hill but along the foot of this hill, is not it so?

IR. FURNESS: I object. I think the prosecutor does not strte what the witness testified.

THE PRUSIDENT: "cll, it must be put to him properly.

A I shall reply. This sketch map, without any scale, was drawn by a staff officer nurely out of memory. This map, without any scale, without any compess, was sketched purely out of memory by a staff officer. However, according to this map drawn from memory it aprears that the border line passes through

1 2

3

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

TANAKA

the east side of the hill.

TH PRESIDENT: Mejor Furness.

ing on the ground that it is outside the scope of the direct examination. I did not ask him what this was a map of. I did not ask him enything except what certain signs on the map meant and it is my contention that the cross-examination should be confined to that.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you contend that this crises out of the cross-examination -- out of the direct examination, General Vasiliev?

GENERAL VASILIEV: My contention is, your Honor, that if the defense counsel asks about a legend on the map I have the right to ask about the same -- all the signs on the map.

THE PRESIDENT: He was called to testify about the meaning of markingson the map but not these particular markings, if I understand correctly.

The objection is upheld.

the attention of the Honorable Members of the Trib nal to the fact that this map contradicts the man attached to the Hunchun Agreement and is someting in between, neither the Jananese version nor the Russian one, and simply has no probative value.

That is all, your Honor. I have no questions. 1 MR. FURNESS: Of course, if your Honor please, 2 those are questions for the Tribunal to decide; not 3 the prosecution. 4 THE PRESIDENT: The book should be marked 5 for identification. 6 GINERAL VASILIEV: I ask to make this book 7 for identification. CLIRK OF THE COURT: The book printed in 9 Japanese, styled "Reference on Tactical Activities," 10 will receive exhibit No. 2648 for identification 11 only. 12 (Whereunon, the book above referred 13 to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 2648 14 for identification.) 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

TANAKA

| W |
|---|
| h |
| 9 |
| 1 |
| е |
| n |
| & |
| S |
| е |
| 1 |
| Z |
| е |
| r |
|   |

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FURNESS

O General TANAKA, under Japanese law is it required that any book print at the end of it the name of the person legally responsible for it?

A Yes.

Q And your testimony that MAEDA, Iwatero is the person responsible, legally responsible for it is based on something in that book?

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I object to this line of questioning as to the matters concerned with the nublishing of this book. This witness has no cualifications and he should not be asked such questions.

THE PRESIDENT: These questions arise out of the cross examination clearly, and are admissible. The objection is overruled.

- O Where in the book is that indicated?
- A The last page.
- O Was that book used as a text book by army officers?
- A No.

He already said so.

excused.)

1 O Does the fact that it comes from the Imperial Library indicate that it has any official 3 status? 4 A No it does not. O Now, regardless of the fact that that book 6 says that cross signs mean certain things, is it a 7

to use them to indicate points of conflict? THE PAYSIDERT: He need not answer again.

fact that it is the practice of the Japanese army

IR. FURNESS: Nev the witness then be released on the usual terms, your Monor? THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly. (Phereupon, the witness was

MR. FURNESS: Your Honor please, there are certain matters still to be dealt with in the subdivision of the defense's case on the Russian phase. I mean the sub-division relating to the Changkufeng incident. One is the question of the Annex to the Hunchun Protocol, the witness, H/Y/SHI, and the Litvinov Diary of August 10th and 11th, which the prosecution tells me they are going to give me. Also there is left the re-examination of the witness,

HASHII OTO GUN, after the prosecution has furnished

24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the defense and the Tribunal with the map which was attached to the original of Exhibit 766. I still have a few witnesses which have not yet been available and I am not certain when they will be available, but I will try to produce them as soon as possible.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the reason for their non-production now, Major Furness?

MR. FURNESS: Some are ill but we expect they will get well, others we have not been able to prepare the affidavits yet. There may be other matters revealed in the record, but I think I have covered them all. With that in mind, Mr. Blakeney will now carry on the next phases of the defense on the Russian phase.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, the next point to be made the object of evidence is the Nomonhan, or Khalkin-Gol incident. I shall first offer in evidence, as proof that the territory in which the soi-disant Mongolian People's Republic was established not only was indisputably Chinese, but had been expressly recognized to be such by the U.S.S.R., DD1576, being excerpts from the convention signed in Peking in 1924 between the U.S.S.R. and the Republic of China.

2-1

1 the

the defense and the Tribunal with the map which was attached to the original of Exhibit 766. I still have a few witnesses which have not yet been available and I am not certain when they will be available, but I will try to produce them as soon as possible.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the reason for their non-production now, Major Furness?

MR. FURNESS: Some are ill but we expect
they will set well, others we have not been able to
prepare the affidavits yet. There may be other
matters revealed in the record, but I think I have
covered them all. With that in mind, Mr. Blakeney
will now carry on the next phases of the defense on
the Russian phase.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MP. BL/KENEY: If the Tribunel please, the next point to be made the object of evidence is the Nomonhan, or Khalkin-Gol incident. I shall first offer in evidence, as proof that the territory in which the soi-disant Mongolian People's Republic was established not only was indisputably Chinese, but had been expressly recognized to be such by the U.S.S.R., DD1576, being excerpts from the convention signed in Peking in 1924 between the U.S.S.R. and the Republic of China.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May I ask a question to find out for what purpose is this document presented, and what is the purpose of this document?

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid you will have to leave that to the Bench, if they are in doubt, General. You can raise any objection you like.

Major Blakeney gave his reason. Are you going to object to it?

GENERAL VASILIEV: I don't see that this document has any relevancy to the issues of the case.

THE PRESIDENT: You object to it on the ground of irrelevancy. Major Blakeney, what do you-GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, your Honor, that is quite correct, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, we will hear you.

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the document is clearly relevant for at least four reasons which I shall state seriatim.

Firstly, Minister Golunsky, in his opening of the Russian phase for the prosecution, stated on page 7254 of the record that Japan - "knew well of the existing treaty of mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

1 2

20-

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL V/SILIEV: May I ask a question to find out for what purpose is this document presented,

and what is the purpose of this document?

THE PRESIDENT: I am afraid you will have to leave that to the Bench, if they are in doubt, General. You can raise any objection you like.

Major Blakeney gave his reason. Are you going to object to it?

GENERAL VASILIEV: I dont see that this document has any relevancy to the issues of the case.

THE PRESIDENT: You object to it on the ground of irrelevancy. Major Blakeney, what do you -- GENER/L V/SILIEV: Yes, your Honor, that is quite correct, your Honor.

THE FRUSIDENT: Major Blakeney, we will hear you.

MR. BL/KFNEY: I think the document is clearly relevant for at least four reasons which I shall state seriatim.

. Firstly, Minister Golunsky, in his opening of the Russian phase for the prosecution, stated on page 7254 of the record that Japan - "knew well of the existing treaty of mutual assistance between the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

They knew beforehand that an attack on the territory of this Republic would inevitably lead to a clash of arms with the Soviet Union and consciously were ready to do it." That is the end of the quotation. The Nomonhan incident is thus charged as aggression against the U.S.S.R but if the territory involved was Chinese, the Tribunal may well wonder a little how the case is made out. Japan knowing well that the U.S.S.R's solemn recognition by treaty of the China Sovereignty over outer Mongolia, could in no way have supposed that frontier troubles of cuter Mongolia would in any way involve a foreign power.

Secondly, I shall presently, on the question of the Manchurian Mongolian frontier or boundary, offer some evidence from Chinese sources. Clearly, the weight to be attached to this evidence may depend to some extent upon the question of sovereignty over the territory involved. That is, the Chinese can speak of the boundaries of their own country with more authority than those of a foreign country.

Thirdly, the evidence has shown, and will show that much of the national and especially military policy of Japan was conditioned by what was considered to be the Soviet menace of which Japan was never unconscious. Japan may well indeed have been moved

They knew beforehand that an attack on the territory of this Republic would inevitably lead to a clash of arms with the Soviet Union and consciously were ready to do it." That is the end of the quotation. The Nomonhan incident is thus charged as aggression against the U.S.S.R. but if the territory involved was Chinese, the Tribunal may well wonder a little how the case is made out. Japan knowing well that the U.S.S.R.'s solemn recognition by treaty of the China Sovereignty over outer l'ongolia, could in no way have supposed that frontier troubles of outer l'ongolia would in any tay involve a foreign power.

Secondly, I shall presently, on the question of the Manchurian Mongolian frontier or boundary, offer some evidence from Chinese sources. Clearly, the weight to be attached to this evidence may depend to some extent upon the question of sovereighty over the territory involved. That is, the Chinese can speak of the boundaries of their own country with more authority than those of a foreign country.

Thirdly, the evidence has shown, and will show that much of the national and especially military policy of Japan was conditioned by what was considered to be the Soviet menace of which Japan was never unconscious. Japan may well indeed have been moved

to take military measures of self-defense by the discovery that the U.S.S.R. was even extending it's military threat by establishing and entering into a military alliance with puppet states on the periphery of Manchuria.

And, fourthly, the Soviet encroachment in outer Mongolia has a bearing on the question whether the Nine Power Treaty, Prosecution's Exhibit 28, had become a dead letter, for while the U.S.S.R. was not a signatory of that treaty, nevertheless, it's action in violation thereof could but effect alteration of the fundamental conditions in which, and the hypothesis upon which that treaty which the defendants are charged with violating was grounded. That is my submission, your Honors.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Might I be allowed to say a few words?

THE PRESIDENT: Well there is no objection, go shead. We have prevented Mr. Keenan from replying where he opened the debate. If the defense have no objection we will hear you. If they have, we must not allow you.

MR. BLAKENEY: No objection whatever.

to take military measures of self-defense by the discovery that the U.S.S.R. was even extending its military threat by establishing and entering into a military alliance with puppet states on the periphery of Manchuria.

And, fourthly, the Soviet encroachment in outer Mongolia has a bearing on the question whether the Mine Power Treaty, Prosecution's Exhibit 28, had become a dead letter, for while the U.S.R.R. was not a signatory of that treaty, nevertheless, its action in violation thereof could but effect alteration of the fundamental conditions in which, and the hypothesis upon which that treaty which the defendants are charged with violating was grounded. That is my submission, your Honors.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Might I be allowed to say a few words?

THE P'ESIDENT: Well there is no objection, go shead. We have prevented Mr. Keenan from replying where he opened the debate. If the defense have no objection we will hear you. If they have, we must not allow you.

MR. BLAKENEY: No objection whatever.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I wanted to ask the honorable Members of the Tribunal to pay their attention to the following circumstances, circumstances relating to the tactics adopted by the defense and which encroach upon my rights.

The document has been presented without explanation given for what purpose it is presented -- it has been presented. Therefore, I objected to the introduction of this document in general form:

keplying to me the defense gave their explanation consisting of four points. Naturally, it throws new light upon the question, and, therefore, I address the Court asking the permission to reply because I know that usually it is not allowed to reply for the second time.

THE PRESIDENT: At some stage or other the Court may see fit to prevent a reply even if the defense does not object. But this does not appear to be a point on which we should do that.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Thank you, your Honor:

So first the purpose of the presentation of this document is the wish on the part of the defense to question the sovereignty of the Mongolian People's Republicant, secondly, as far as I understood, it is an attempt to prove that the U.S.S.R. is allegedly an aggressive

party in her relations to China and violated the treaties concluded with China.

The question of relations between the U.S.S.R., China and the Mongolian People's Republic has no relevancy whatsoever to the issues of this case. At any
rate it is not up to the Japanese war criminals to take
upon themselves the defense of the interests of China
and Mongolian People's Republic.

THE PRESIDENT: You must not refer to the accused as Japanese war criminals. They have not yet been convicted.

GENERAL VASILIEV: As far as I understand they were brought before this Tribunal as Japanese war criminals, major Japanese war criminals. Maybe I am mistaken, I don't know. But so far I was not mistaken.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not so. And as far as we are concerned they are innocent until they are proved guilty.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I am of the same opinion, your Honor. But the defense defend the interests of the Japanese war criminals, and, therefore, I call them this name. I am not going to say that this question is settled.

In my submission the defense has no right to question the sovereignty of the Mongolian People's

-

Republic. Besides this question is out of the scope of jurisdiction of this Tribunal under the Charter.

It is a fact of common knowledge known to the whole world that by a plebiscite the people of the Mongolian People's Republic last year once more confirmed their separate independence from China state existence and China agreed to it. There was no other interpretation of this question.

On these grounds I ask the honorable Tribunal to reject the document because it purports to mislead the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court rejects the contention of the prosecution and admits the document on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1576 will receive exhibit No. 2649.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2649 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit.

"Signed at Peking May 31, 1924."

The excerpts are Articles IV and V.

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in accordance with its policy and Declarations of 1919 and 1920, declares that all Treaties, Agreements,

et cetera, concluded between the former Tsarist Government and any third party or parties affecting the sovereign rights or interests of China, are null and void.

"The Governments of both Contracting Parties declare that in future neither Government will conclude any treaties or agreements which prejudice the sovereign rights or interests of either Contracting Party.

"Article V. The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes that Outer Mongolia is an integral part of the Republic of China and respects China's sovereignty therein.

"The Government of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics declares that as soon as the questions
for the withdrawal of all the troops of the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics from Outer Mongolia--namely,
as to the time limit of the withdrawal of such troops and
the measures to be adopted in the interests of the safety
of the frontiers--are agreed upon at the Conference as
provided in Article II of the present Agreement, it will
effect the complete withdrawal of all the troops of the
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from Outer Mongolia."

The mutual assistance pact which in despite of this treaty was entered into with the puppet Mongolian People's Republic, and under color of which Soviet troops were stationed on the soil of China in Outer Mongolia,

has been introduced into evidence as prosecution exhibit 214, and was read into the record at pages 2,715-18 of the transcript. I therefore leave it with this reference to it, and with the comment that it shows that by March 1936 the U.S.S.R. had obtained colorable right to military occupation of Outer Mongolia.

On the question of the boundary between Manchukuo and Mongolian People's Republic, I call as a witness YANO, Mitsuji, whose testimony is embodied in defense document 1601.

M I T S U J I Y A N O, called as a witness on behalf 1 of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified 2 through Japanese interpreters as follows: 3 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner. 4 MR. TAVENNER: The document was on an order 5 list which was served on us this morning, and the affi-6 7 davit has not been served on us, and we, of course, have not seen it. We think in the interest of orderly procedure 8 we should be able to be permitted to read the affidavit 9 10 before the witness is used. 11 THE PRESIDENT: We will have fifteen minutes 12 in which to read it during the recess. 13 MR. TAVENNER: That is provided we get it. THE PRESIDENT: Well, we won't hear the witness 14 15 until you do. 16 Take his name and address and other formal 17 parts, Major Blakeney. 18 MR. BLAKENEY: Yes, sir. 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION 20 BY MR. BLAKENEY: 21 Mr. Witness, state your name and residence, Q 22 please. 23 My name is YANO, Mitsuji. My present address, 24 No. 2431 5-Chome, Kami-Meguro, Meguro-ku, Tokyo. 25 Mh. BLAKENEY: I ask that he be handed defense

DIRECT

```
document 1601.
1
                  (Whereupon, a document was handed to
2
        the witness.)
3
             MA. TAVENNER: I object, your Honor, to the
4
   tendering of the affidavit until we have had an opportunity
5
6
   to see it.
             MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit is not yet ten-
7
   dered. The affidavit is to be presented to the witness
8
9
   for his identification.
             THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen
10
11
   minutes.)
12
                   (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was
        taken until 1100, after which the proceedings
13
14
        were resumed as follows:)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Duda & Leftle

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far Dast is now resumed.

THE PRESIDE T: Major Blakeney.

of when affidavits of witnesses must be served is likely to arise again from time to time, perhaps I should state our conception of the regulation upon which we have acted in making our preparations.

THE PRESIDENT: It might start a lengthy debate unnecessarily, Major Blakeney. Deal with it when you have to.

Were you objecting, Mr. Tavenner?

prosecution does object to the offering of an affidavit in evidence before it has an opportunity to examine it and determine to what extent objection should be made and until it has had a reasonable opportunity to make such an examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Then, I take it that you are objecting to any affidavit by this witness being tendered now.

IR. TAVENNER: Yes, sir. We have not seen a copy of the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now, Major Blakeney, you may state your contentions.

11

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

23

subject of discussion a number of times in chambers and in open court. The question of requiring defense witnesses to testify by affidavit first arose in the hearing in chambers on the 20th of March this year. At that time, Mr. Tavenner, being present, made the contention that the affidavits, so required to be prepared, should be served on the prosecution twenty four hours in advance of presentation in court, as if they were documents.

It being pointed out by the defense on that occasion that this would compel the disclosure of our evidence in advance, the President finally made the following statement or ruling. This is on page 18 of the record of the proceedings in chambers on the 20th of March.

"For the time being" -- I am quoting the President's words -- "I will exempt you from the obligation, subject to the approval of my brother Judges, to give copies of such affidavits as you are required to furnish to the prosecution and, finally, confine the obligation to the Judges."

The actual order requiring affidavits to be used was made in open court on the 25th of

S

March, transcript page 19100. On page 19101 of the transcript, the following colloquy occured:

"MR. ROBIRTS: May 1 inquire if it is the purpose of the Court to have the affidavits served upon the prosecution as well before the witness is produced?

"THE PRESIDENT: That point has been raised in chambers. I told you it would be sufficient if you served the Judges."

I wish to add only this, that, as the Tribunal is aware, we are not putting our evidence in affidavit form voluntarily or from our preference. We, therefore, feel that, in the circumstances of our being compelled so to proceed, it would be grossly unfair to us to compel us also to make all of our evidence available to the prosecution in advance. This point was made and fully argued in the hearing in chambers, and I submit that the decision made thereafter is the only correct and just decision on this point.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, for nearly three months copies of the affidavits have been served on the prosecution. As a result, in numerous instances objections were made prior to the introduction of those affidavits which we were enabled by reason of time to study in advance. Some affidavits were eliminated entirely; in other instances, crossexamination was valved by the prosecution. I am confident there would have been many more crossexaminations conducted if the prosecution had been suddenly confronted with the testimony as it was being read from the affidavit.

I can conceive of no element of unfairness to the defense as a result of the experience we have nad to the present time. So, from the standpoint of practical efficiency in the conduct of a long trial, we think it is very important that the practice that has been in existence now for three months be continued.

I desire also to point out that the procedure at Nuornberg had as its practical effect the same as we have experienced here in the past three months.

At Nuernberg the testimony was settled -- the objections to it, settled before it was introduced before the Tribunal. Both the prosecution and the defense were

heard in the settlement of the objections.

We are unable to understand now why there should be any unfairness to the defense in the prosecution's knowing, within a reasonable length of time ahead of the introduction of the affidavit, of the contents of it. It can in no sense change the character of the evidence. Probably what the defense has in mind in its objection is that by knowing a short time in advance of the contents of the afficavit, that the prosecution is given an opportunity to see what the prosecution's evidence is that bears on the same matter and to assemble it in an orderly manner and present it to the Tribunal. We submit that any procedure which enables us to submit the matter fairly and promptly and efficiently to the Tribunal could not be a matter of unfairness to the defense.

It is submitted, therefore, that the opportunity requested should be given.

MR. BLAKENEY: What Mr. Tavenner's plea comes to is this: This procedure would help the prosecution. We do not think that such is the purpose of the Tribunal. Had we had such an order in effect during the presentation of the prosecution's case, it would have nelped us in many ways. But we never thought to ask the prosecution to divulge their evidence to us twenty-four

hours beforehand. So far as I know, in three instances 1 the prosecution elected -- were not compelled, but elected -- to introduce testimony by affidavit, and in those cases they served the document. Perhaps more than three; three important cases that I remember.

As to Nuermberg, two observations occur to me. The first is that this Tribunal has repeatedly stated that it does not and will not slavishly follow the procedure of the Tribunal at Nuernberg. The second is that I am advised -- and I am speaking only on that advice -- that at Nuernberg testimony was not given of compulsion by affidavit, but was taken orally in open court. I am so advised by counsel who has attended proceedings at the Nuernberg Tribunal.

While it is true that in the two months, not three, since the Tribunal ordered the reduction of testimony to written form we have served them in advance, I find it very difficult to see how that custom of ours should now have ripened into a rule that we must do so, in contravention of the rule already announced by the Tribunal.

MR. TAVENNER: May I be permitted to reply to a new matter brought out by counsel in his argument?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you may.

FR. TAVENNER: I am advised by associate counsel

2

3 4

5

6

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

who participated in the Nuernberg trials and who
introduced evidence in the course of the trial, for
whatever persuasive value it has, that affidavits were
compelled to be used in all except four or five
instances.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, if they
changed their ruling or if we change ours, it would

be as a result of our experience.

Some Numbers of the Court desire to have this matter discussed in chambers, and in the circumstances

We will adjourn for some minutes.

that discussion will take place.

(Whereupon, at 1125, a recess was taken until 1150, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has considered the question raised by Major Blakeney as to the service of defense affidavits in advance on the prosecution as well as on the Judges. Notwithstanding the ruling of the Tribunal in favor of the defense in that matter, the defense for the last two months or so has seen fit, of their own volition, to serve copies of their affidavits on the prosecution as well as on the Judges. That course has proved conducive to expedition, as to which the parties are referred to Article 12a and b of the Charter. Noreover, it has not been prejudicial to the defense, as the defense, by their voluntary actions, have confirmed.

Faving regard to the experience of the Tribunal in this matter, a majority of the Tribunal require that the practice of serving the prosecution as well as the Judges be continued. We require the practice be followed in respect of the affidavit of the witness now on the stand. To give the parties an opportunity to readjust the position, we will adjourn until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1153, a recess was

24

25

taken.)

Morse & Barton

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330, Hon. Ju-Ao Mei, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

MITSUI YANO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: In connection with the matter discussed just before the recess, I should like to state for the record that so far as concerns the defense having voluntarily complied with the new rule, so far as this counsel is concerned I have done so in a few instances as a matter of courtesy in cases where I thought it would not be prejudicial to the defense.

We are now, of course, proceeding to comply with the rule fully, and in that connection I should like to ask whether the time for service of affidavits will be the same as with other documents generally.

THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the intention, Major. At least three days, is it?

MR. BLAKENEY: Twenty-four hours. THE PRESIDENT: Twenty-four hours I am told. Yes, that is the position. MR. BLAKENEY: I am not advised whether the prosecution proposes to object to my proceeding with the witness YANO. MR. TAVENNER: The prosecution does not object to proceeding with this witness. BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

I again ask that the witness be handed defense document No. 1601, and I ask you, Mr. "itness, whether that is your affidavit, signed and sealed by you.

(Whereupon, the document was handed

to the witness.)

Yes.

Are the contents thereof true and correct?

Yes.

MR. BLAKENEY: Defense document 1601, the affidavit of YANO Mitsui, is offered in evidence.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, having read the effidavit of this witness, Y/NO Mitsui, we object to the admission of the document on the following grounds:

This is not a witness, but an expert testifying on any matters and among them on rules adopted by

1

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

3

6

7

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

the Ching dynasty on symbolic religious structures -see paragraph 2 of the affidavit -- and then some rather remote and abstract matters. I believe that in case there was any need to call an expert on these matters it would be necessary choose a competent and importial person, but a former Japanese intelligence officer connected with the events, whose education was limited by the Foreign Language School and practical experience by conducting some special and absolutely inconsiderable investigations for the Japanese intelligence service, cannot be examined for that purpose.

In substance, the witness is colled only for the purpose of presenting to the Court through him quotations from books and three maps, only two of which, by the way, were served on the prosecution. Moreover, the prosecution has no quotations from these books translated properly up to this time. The books themselves are not official materials and are, therefore, inadmissible.

If the defense wish to introduce these quotetions, books and maps they should have done it in the usual way but not through the witness who was not the author of these books and maps and has no relation to them whatsoever. And last, in substance the witness testified on one fact known to him with certainty.

22,991

ONAY

It is the fact stated in paragraph 6. This fact of
the witness having made some trip around the right
bank of the Haluha River has no relevance to the issues
of the case.

We object to the introduction of the affidavit in its entirety but if the Court does not agree with it we, in any case, ask to delete paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this affidavit which must be proved by other way -- in other ways.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakency.

the witness' qualifications is, perhaps, immaterial because he does not purport to testify as an expert.

He makes no pretense, of course, of testifying to rules adopted by the Ching dynasty but quotes from a book which he says he has with him and tenders therewith what is therein stated about rules of the Ching dynasty.

The translations of the quotations were, of course, served on the prosecution because they are contained in the body of the affidavit itself. It is true that owing to the over-burdening of the facilities of the photographic section of the Tribunal apparently they have been unable to complete in time the photographic copy of one of the maps, and we shall, of course, have to request leave to reserve the presentation of

that until it is available.

.

The objection that the books are inadmissible as evidence because they are not official publications sounds rather strange in view of the character of evidence which has been introduced in this trial from the beginning and in view of the purpose of the presentation of these books which is to show that standard authoritative works adopt a certain line of thought in connection with the question. The books, of course, would be admissible for whatever probative value they may have in the eyes of the Tribunal if they were tendered in the usual way, which counsel suggest must be adopted. It is, then, exceedingly difficult to see why they should be rendered inadmissible by the attempt to integrate them with testimony on the same subject.

THE PRESIDENT: One of the books is by an unknown author. That wouldn't be authoritative, of course.

Chinese sources and, while its probative value will naturally be much lower in the circumstances, it is submitted to the Tribunal that it has some probative value on the question.

THE PRESIDENT : By a priority the Court overrules the objection and admits the document on

the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1601 will receive exhibit No. 2650. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2650 and received in evidence.) 

MR. BLAKENEY: I now read the affidavit:

2

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

"I am a former colonel of the Japanese Army, at present residing in Tokyo. Since the middle 1930's my official duties have been largely concerned with questions of investigation of Mangolia. In February-December 1936 I served in a unit guarding the border in the Holombair district; in April 1937 I entered the Tekyo Foreign Language School, Mongolian course, as a government student; from July to November 1937 I served in the second department (intelligence) of the General Staff Office, being concerned with Mongolian affairs; in November 1937-January 1938, September-November 1938, June-July 1939 and June-July 1940, I was specially ordered to undertake investigations in various areas of Inner Mongolia, Sui-yuan and other areas adjacent to Outer Mongolia; and from February 1939 to July 1941 I was commander of the investigation detachment of the Japanese Army stationed at Kalgan, Inner Mongolia. Among other questions I have made a special study of boundaries in Manchuria and Mongolia.

"2. The territories known as Manchoukuo and the Mongolian People's Republic were originally under the same rule, that of the Ching Dynasty. Among the regulations adopted by the Ching rulers for governing the Mongolian race was the following, to be found in

the book in Japanese entitled Mongolian Topography,
written by KASHIWABARA Takahisa and HAMADA Jun-ichi,
and published by FUZANBO in 1919, Volume II, paragraph 7, "Manners and Customs", item "Festivals",
interpretation of the word "obo", which book is in my
possession and is produced herewith: 'In cases where
pasturage is carried on and no mountain or river can
be found to serve as a boundary an obo shall be established to mark the boundary. --"

I am sorry, the quotation should close at that point:

"Between Hsingan-Peisheng province of Manchoukuo and Haluha-miao and Handagaya of the so-called
Mongolian People's Republic there is no obo (a symbolic religious structure) to mark the boundary, but
there is the river Haluha (also known as Khalkin Gol),
which therefore must serve as boundary.

"3. Among the literature referring to the boundary between the territories now known as Hsingan-Peishang province and the Mongolian People's Republic, is a book entitled <u>History of Nomadic Life in Mongolia</u>, written by the Chinese Chang Mu (1805-1849), Japanese translation by SUSA Kakitsu, which book is in my possession and is produced herewith. That the boundary is the Haluha River is clearly shown by the following

passage from Section I, 'Inner Mongolia', Chapter I, paragraph 2, 'Jariate', page 31 of the book: 'According to the Lung Sha Chi Luch by Fang Shih-chi, 'the area from the southern part of Molombair west to the Haluha River belongs to the land of Barga, and is originally a part of Haluha.' Further, this is said 'The pasture lies to the north of Mount So-yuch-erh-chi and to the bank of the Haluha River' (Section II, 'Outer Mongolia', Chapter IV, paragraph 1, 'Che-Che-hen'). These boundaries are clearly indicated on the map annexed to the book, which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit 'A'.

"4. There is a book entitled Holombair, compiled about 1928 by an unknown author in the Chinese language, which book is in my possession and is produced herewith. In Chapter I, the section on 'General Outline of Holombair', paragraph 'Position and Area', page 1, explanation is made in the following terms of the boundary of Holombair (that which draws the line of demarcation between Hsingan-Peisheng province, and the territory called the Mongolian People's Republic: 'The Boundary starts from Mont So-yueh-erh-chi in the south and runs in a northeasterly direction until it reaches the Haluha River, which it follows to a point northeast of Lake Bair, running through the middle of the lake, then southwest!, etc. According to the map

annexed to the book, which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit 'B', the boundary between Hsingan-Peisheng and the Mongolian People's Republic is shown as the Haluha River.

"5. The Japanese General Staff Office had maps of Eastern Asia, compiled by the Surveying Office, of a scale 1:2,500,000. The map attached hereto and marked Exhibit 'C' is one of the maps used by me during my tenture of office in the General Staff Office, from which it appears that the boundary of Hsingan-Peisheng province and the Mongolian People's Republic is the Haluha River.

make a survey of the boundary of Manchuria and Mongolia, and confirmed the above facts on the spot. I started from Haron Aershan to the Nomonhan border post, going along the Haluha River after passing through Handagaya, and on the first night camped out on the way. On the following day I passed the border post and reached the junction of the Holston Gol (River) with the Haluha, and again bivouncked on the righthand bank of the river. On this occasion I was accompanied by two Mongolians, and noticed that our progress was followed by two Outer Mongolian mounted guards who parallelled our course on the lefthand bank of the river, keeping

more than a thousand meters distant but usually staying within sight, and apparently having the purpose of watching my party. During the two days we saw no other human beings. The two Mongolian guards made no effort to cross the Haluha, nor did they make any effort to molest my party on the righthand bank. The mounted guards wore the uniform of the army of the 'Mongolian People's Republic', and carried rifles. I continued through Nomotschrin to Amkoro without interferences from the Outer Mongolian side, and accordingly reported to my superior officers that I had found the Faluha to be the boundary."

MR. BLAKENTY: I wish to call attention to the fact that in connection with the map, which is marked document 1601-C and not yet served but of which the original has been tendered, there is also a certificate of origin and date bearing the same document number recently distributed.

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Are we to get comies of the exhibits mentioned in the offidavit? The annexures should be tendered for identification.

MR. BLAKENFY: Yes, I will be glad to tender the originals at this time.

BY MR. BLAKENFY (Continued):

- Q Mr. Witness, will you please identify and hand to the clerk of the court the book "History of Nomedic Life in Mongolia" by Chang Mu?
  - A I understand.
  - Q Is that it which you have in your hand?
  - A Yes.

MR. BLAKFNEY: That book and the map attached are tendered for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The book entitled "History of Nomadic Li e in Mongolia" will receive exhibit No. 2651 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above

r 1

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24.

referred to was marked defense exhibit 1 No. 2651 for identification.) 2 3000 Then, Mr. Witness, will you identify and hand to the clerk the book entitled "Holombair," 1928? A I shall do so. 5 IR. PLAKINEY: That book also is tendered for 6 identification. 7 CLIRK OF THE COURT: The book entitled "Holombeir" 8 will receive exhibit No. 2652 for identification only. 9 (Whereupon, the document above 10 referred to was marked defense exhibit 11 No. 2652 for identification.) 12 MR. BLAKENFY: And, finally, will you identify 13 and hand to the clark the Japanese General Staff Office 14 map of Bastern Asia referred to in your testimony as 15 16 exhibit C. 17 The map, together with the attached certificate 18 of origin is tendered for identification. 19 CLFRK OF THE COURT: The map referred to as 20 defense document 1601-C will receive exhibit No. 2653 21 for identification only. 22 (Whereupon, the document above

referred to was marked defense exhibit

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the man could be tendered

No. 2653 for identification.)

24.

finally subject to any objection. The books are tendered for identification because it is not meant the whole should be in evidence but only a special part.

IR. BL.KENEY: The original map actually should be attached to the original of the affidavit as exhibit C thereto, I believe.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

haven't heard. It seems to us that the defense did not tender for identification the book about Nomedic Life of the Mangalians mentioned in paragraph 3 of the affidavit.

MR. BL.KINFY: It was identified as exhibit 2651.

of the exhibit mentioned in paragraph 2. The exhibits mentioned in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were tendered for identification.

referred to in paragraph 2 because there is no question of the map, but I shall be glad to make tender, also, of that book which is entitled "longolian Topograph," and for that purpose I ask the witness to identify it and hand it to the clerk.

4 5

THE PRESIDENT: That will be for identification only?

MR. BL KENFY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: But now an excerpt from that has been admitted into evidence. To can receive it as part of the affidavit. However there is no use having it twice.

IR. BL/KENLY: My feeling was it would save time, paper, and labor by so incorporating it in the affidevit.

CLIRK OF THE COURT: The book entitled "Mongolian Topography" will receive exhibit No. 2654 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was maked defense exhibit No. 2654 for identification only.)

Whalen & Selze

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

MAR. BLAKENEY: In connection with the map, which is exhibit C of the affidavit, I should like also to read into the record the certificate attached thereto. This is the certificate of the Chief of Geographical Survey of the Ministry of Home Affairs as follows--

THE MONITOR: Mr. Blakeney, we don't have the document delivered to us yet.

AM. BLAKENEY: It is very short. You can translate as I read it.

"I hereby certify that the following was produced by the Imperial Survey Department: 1:2,500,000 East Asia Continental Map. Set of four sheets printed in four colors. Prints prepared in 1927 and revised and reprinted in 1937."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, we are now about to have cross-examination I assume based on those maps. Without those maps we will not be able to follow any such cross-examination intelligently.

MR. BLAKENEY: I don't understand that the Tribunal is missing all of the maps; is it?

THE FRESIDENT: We have no maps at all; none of the maps referred to in this affidavit at all events.

MR. BLAKENEY: I regret very much that there seems to have been a contretemps of some sort, because

23,004 YANO

1 I have all except the last map in English and I have them all in Japanese, or Chinese, as the case may be. THE PRESIDENT: You are right. They have not 4 been distributed. 5 Mh. BLAKENEY: Since in any event one is missing. if the Tribunal desires I will be quite glad to have cross-examination postponed if counsel are willing. 8 COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I respectfully 9 beg you to give me directions whether to start cross-10 examination now or to wait until the missing copies 11 of the maps shall be served. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Two out of the three maps men-13 tioned have been served on us. Two out of the three maps distributed are parts of books. Is there a third 15 one? 16 COLO EL SMIRNOV: May I start cross-examining, your Honor? 18 THE PRESIDENT: No. We want all three maps, 19 or copies thereof.

MA. BLAKENEY: Then may I suggest that the witness be stood down at this time until such time as we can secure the maps from the photographic section?

THE PRESIDERT: The question of boundaries is of vital importance, and we must know what the witness is talking about from looking at maps.

14

17

20

21 22

23,004 YANO

I have all except the last map in English and I have 1 them all in Japanese, or Chinese, as the case may be. 3 THE PRESIDENT: You are right. They have not 4 been distributed.

MA. BLAKENEY: Since in any event one is missing, if the Tribunal desires I will be quite glad to have cross-examination postponed if counsel are willing.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I respectfully beg you to give me directions whether to start crossexamination now or to wait until the missing copies of the maps shall be served.

THE PRESIDENT: Two out of the three maps mentioned have been served on us. Two out of the three maps distributed are parts of books. Is there a third one?

COLO EL SMIRNOV: May I start cross-examining, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: No. We want all three maps, or copies thereof.

MA. BLAKENEY: Then may I suggest that the witness be stood down at this time until such time as we can secure the maps from the photographic section?

THE PRESIDENT: The question of boundaries is of vital importance, and we must know what the witness is talking about from looking at maps.

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

On what maps do you propose to cross-examine, Colonel?

3

2

We have before us the copies of the maps referred to in the books that have been tendered. We have not a copy of the map from the Japanese General Staff office.

7

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I can't answer your question until I myself see the third map. I haven't seen it as yet.

9

THE PRESIDENT: The witness is stood down for cross-examination later.

11

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: My next document, which was

to have been defense document No. 1320, is in the same

condition, that is to say the maps of which it consists

have been in the course of photographic reproduction

for some weeks and have not yet arrived. It consists

of maps only, and while, of course, I have nothing to

tender at this moment, I mention it here for the sake

of continuity of the evidence when it is introduced

13

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

later.

24

I now come, Language Section, to exhibit 745.

That the Japanese Government did at various times take the initiative in proposing the adoption of measures

for the prevention of possible border incidents is apparent from the prosecution's own evidence, exhibit 745, an "oral statement" delivered by Foreign Minister UCHIDA to Soviet Ambassador Troyanovsky on the 13th of December 1932, in paragraph 3 of which the following suggestion is contained:

"For the time being it will be of avail if both governments will confer together on peaceful methods of preventing and solving locally all sorts of difficulties that may accidentally arise due to the fact that the Japanese and Soviet troops are stationed so close to one another. The creation of a Japane-Soviet-Manchurian committee to prevent border incidents may become one of such means."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVERNER: I would like to call to the Tribunal's attention that that same paragraph was read by the defense two days ago.

MR. BLAKENEY: If that is correct I apologize for trespassing on the Tribunal's time. But I point out that does not affect the validity of the point.

MR. TAVENNER: May I be heard again on this matter, your Honor?

There has been a tendency in the later phases of the case to argue the case as the documents are

1 2

being presented, and if this matter is repeated it can only be for the sake of argument.

I called this general type of objection to the Tribunal's attention one or two days ago, and I would like to do it again because it is quite apparent that the defense instead of referring to documents is arguing documents.

THE PRESIDENT: The prosecution also offended in this respect. But two wrongs don't make a right. Do avoid that if you can.

MR. BLAKENEY: Since Mr. Tavenner has gone out of his way to state that I have reread a document to the Tribunal out of improper motives, I want to assure the Tribunal that any instance when I note a document on my list has been read, I so state and so make reference to it.

THE PRESIDERT: Don't waste any more time about it.

MR. BLAKENEY: Such was my feeling.

Prosecution exhibit 704, a strictly secret decision of the Japanese Premier and Foreign, War and Navy Ministers, on 7 August 1936, of foreign policy for the Empire, shows that four years later demarcation of these borders was still Japanese policy. I read paragraphs 1-A and 1-B from page 3 of the document,

assuring the Tribunal that so far as I am aware they have not been read into the record.

"a. Establishments of two committees, one for demarcation of the border line in the region from the Lake Khanaka to the River Tumen and the other for solution of troubles along the border line, as well as the establishment of similar organs dealing with the frontier of other regions between Manchukuo and the Soviet Union and Manchukuo and Mongolia shall be designed.

"b. At an appropriate opportunity the establishment of a non-armed zone shall be proposed."

I shall now read from exhibit 2370, a speech of Foreign Minister ARITA to the Diet on the 21st of January 1937. In reporting on developments in the field of foreign relations he states that the Japanese Government has in that year renewed its proposal to the U.S.S.R. for border demarcation. I read the last paragraph on page 6, not, so far as I am aware, heretofore read in evidence.

"The establishment of Commissions for the Manchoukuo-Soviet border demarcation and settlement of disputes was proposed by our Government in the belief that such bodies would contribute substantially toward the prevention of disputes between Japan, Manchoukuo

1 2

and the Soviet Union, and the harmonization of the tripartite relations. I may say that an agreement of views has been reached on all the basis questions involved, excepting one or two points. And our Government hope to see this question settled as soon as possible."

My next document is exhibit 2497, being a speech of Foreign Minister HIROTA to the Diet on the 27th of July 1937, in which among other things the Foreign Minister again publicly urges the government of the U.S.S.R. to cooperate for the avoidance of border disputes. The document has been read. I therefore call attention specifically to page 4, commencing with line 12 and going to the end of the page.

In my next document, defense document No. 240, we find this same theme being developed after the Nomonhan incident, a conflict of the type which Japan had striven to avert.

The document is offered in evidence.

Well, the Clerk says he hasn't it so we will have to pass it.

I now call as a witness to testify concerning the beginning of the Nomenhan incident, HATTOKI Takushiro, whose testimony is embodied in defense document 1604.

.

9

8

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

21,

23

TAKUSHIRO HATTORI, called as a witness
on behalf of the defense, being first duly
sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters
as follows:

M. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please --THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

which was served during the noon hour today.

Associate counsel who would conduct the examination,
do not desire to waive the service in this instance
heceuse they have not actually seen the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Well the ruld must be adhered to.

ovesting an adjournment then. The service was made in accordance with the rule as it then stood.

THE FRESIDE T: I simply say the rule must be observed. I do not know when it was served.

Fr. Tavenner said it was served during the Juncheon adjournment.

please, that the document was served immediately upon the enunciation of the new rule requiring advance service. I am prepared to proceed in accordance with my order of proof made up under the rule as it

| 1 | then stood. If the presecution are not ready to proceed   |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | I den't believe I should be forced to make a new order    |
| 2 | of proof and proceed in some other way.                   |
| 3 | THE PRESIDENT: Subject to any agreement between           |
| 4 | the parties, we will take this up after lunch tomorrow    |
| 6 | afternoon.                                                |
| 7 | MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, associate           |
| 3 | counsel have now had an opportunity to glance over it and |
| 9 | waive the requirement for twenty-four hour service.       |
| , | DIRECT EXAMINATION                                        |
|   | BY MR. BLAKENEY:                                          |
|   | Q Please state your name and residence.                   |
| 1 | A My address is 42 Hommuracho, Shinjuku-ku,               |
|   | Tokyo, and my name HATTOKI Takushiro.                     |
| 1 | MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that the witness be handed            |
|   | defense document 1604.                                    |
|   | (Whereupon, a document was handed to the                  |
| 1 | witness.)                                                 |
| 1 | Q I ask you, Mr. Witness, whether that is your            |
|   | affidavit bearing your signature and seal?                |
|   | A This is my affidavit and my seal is affixed theret      |
|   | Q Are the contents thereof true and correct?              |
|   | A Yes.                                                    |
| - | THE PRESIDENT: He said yes.                               |

MA. BLAKENEY: I was waiting a moment because

they are having some difficulty in finding -- I'r.
Tavenner has an incomplete copy.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, the afficevit presented to the witness is printed on both sides of the sheet. The only copy we have is printed only on the one side. At this moment we have been presented with corrected affidavits, or rather an affidavit which is correctly printed. And if the Tribunal will bear with us for just one moment we would like to review our previous decision.

THE PRESIDENT: Your previous agreement.

Mr. Tavenner.

will not change our former decision to waive the service.

MT. BLAKEMEY: The affidavit, defense document 1604 is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

object to the introduction in evidence to that part of paragraph 2 which refers to a telegram which is not produced and the absence of which is not accounted for. Objection is also made to the last sentence in the last paragraph in that it refers to a different telegram, the absence of which has not been accounted

the

3

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23,013

for. Objection is also made to the last sentence in the last paragraph in that it refers to a different telegram, the absence of which has not been accounted for and which has not been produced.

MR. EL/KENEY: If the Tribunel please, it is submitted that this objection represents the reductio ad absurdum of this rule which in its origin is a rule of hearsay which we have been applying in connection with documents. The reference to the telegram in section 2, paragraph 1, in no way purports to state the contents of the telegram as a fact. It in no way purports to state the contents of the messare as being true.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not offering the telegram as proof of its contents?

MR. PLAKENEY: Not in any way whatever. A perusal of the pessage shows that the telegram is mentioned as having been the cause or occasion for certain action, the receipt of the telegram.

THE PRESIDENT: Does that apply to the second telegram?

The statement of the affidevit is that someone took
the measure of telegraphing. We can strike out, if
we like, the contents of what he telegraphed. The

14-

.21

important point is that the action was taken. THE PRECIDENT: No, the rule applies if you are relying on the contents of that second telegram in the last paragraph of the affidavit. 4 But apparently you are not so we will disregard both telegrams as to their contents. The objection 6 is upheld in part and rejected in part and the doc-7 ument admitted with those excisions on the usual terms. 10 I think the objection is wholly successful 11 so the objection is upheld.

CLFRK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 1604 will receive exhibit No. 2655.

> ("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2655 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENFY: I read the affidavit omitting the formal parts. (Reading):

"I am a former colonel, and my present residence is 42 Hommuracho Shinjuku-ku, Tokyoto.

"In 1939 at the time of the Nomonhan incident, I was staff officer of the Kwantung Army in charge of operations. The following are the circumstances in which the incident began.

"1. The Kwantung Arry had in its plan of

1

2

3

5

8

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

operations vis-a-vis the U S S R in 1939 no offensive plans toward the western border -- i.e. toward Hailar, Haron Aershan, or the western Outer Mongolian area. At that time in the event of a war's breaking out between Japan and the U S S R, we estimated that the main field of battle in Manchuria would be toward the eastern border, so the Kwantung frmy was to plan to hold out in the west with the minimum strength. Directly after the commencement of a war, it could naturally be expected that a powerful Soviet force would thrust against the Hailar area. Against this our forces were only the 23d Division, then stationed at Hailar, and the Hailar Border Defense Garrison, so that it was to be expected that warfare in this area would within a short period develop by our being completely surrounded by the powerful Soviet Army. So we, on our part, huilt circular fortifications on the heights around Hailar, and prepared to fight to the last, completely on the defensive, thus absorbing the opponent's menowers and accomplishing our object of holding out. The Haron Mershan area, that is on the southern side of the Hsingen mountains, is also a point of strategic interest, and it was hoped to station in this area a

unit capable of fighting, but we had to refrain from

2

3

4

5

6

7

S

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

doing so on account of the over-all manpower question. Eventually, in 1939, we permanently stationed the Aershan Garrison, and we planned in wartime to hold out in this area with the strength of only about a single division. In the study of operations at that time, as related above, whether we would be able to hold out on the front near Heilar to Heron Fershun-in other words to hold out esainst a far more powerful Soviet attack -- was a point which most concerned an officer in charge of operations; but to allot sufficient manpower to this district would have meant the sacrificing of manyower in the main field of battle, operations in the interior, so from consideration of the reneral situation we limited it to the smallest possible numbers. (we were perhaps risking even less than the minimum) which means that instructions for operations were of entirely defensive type, within the boundary of Manchoukuo.

"2. It was late in the afternoon on the 13th that the Kwantuns 'rmy learned that an incident had broken out near Nomenhan on the morning of 12 May 1939. On that afternoon I, together with a few other staff officers, was at the official residence of the Commander of the Kwantung Army, chatting after a meeting concerning inspection of training of

25

24

subordinate units of the Army or some other subject, 1 when a telegrom was forwarded from the Headquarters 2 of the 'rmy by the one in charge." 3 MF. BLAKENEY: Shall I omit the reading 4 of the telegram? 5 6 THE PRESIDENT: No you can go on with the 7 next sentence. 8 PR. BLAKENFY: (Reading) 9 "This telegram was a confidentia" telegram from the 10 commander of the 23d Division (Hailar Defense 11 Commander) to the Commander of the Kwantung frmy. 12 The contents were that on the morning of the 12th 13 a unit belonging to the Outer Mongolian Army, of not 14 less then 700 men, crossed the Haluha River, thus 15 crossing the border, towards the south of the Nomonhan 16 district, attacked the Manchurian guard unit which 17 was on duty for the defense of the border of that 18 erea." 19 THE : LESIDELT: That is where you stop. 20 MT. BLAKENTY: Next paragraph. 21 THE PHESIDENT: No you still have a sentence

22

in that perseranh.

24

25

23

M., BLAKENEY: Well that is part of the contents of the telegram, of course.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think it is. It

does not appear to be.

MR. BL/KENEY: Very well. (Reading)
"The division commander dispatched to the spot a
search-regiment under the command of the division's
search-regiment commander, as well as two infantry
companies, he having decided to drive out the invading Outer Mongolian / rmy.

"It can be seen that it took about 36 hours for information to reach headquarters of the 'rmy in Hsinking, from the time that the incident broke out near Nomonhan, which is accounted for by the fact that the Japanese 'rmy had no installation near that district, and communication to Hailar, about 200 killometers away, was performed by the inefficient communication system of the Manchurian 'rmy. That is why it took such a long time.

"Up to that time the Manchoukuoan border, especially the eastern border, had been sustaining unlawful invasions of the Soviet Army quite often and border disputes were continuous, causing us much worry. The Kwantung Army, whose duty it was to maintain the integrity of Manchuria, could not ignore these unlawful actions, but difficulties always followed their settlement as a result of the scheming of the Soviet Army.

"On receipt of the aforesaid telegram our reaction was, "Has it happened again?" and we felt it unpleasant. Nomonhan being a very out-of-the-way place, and a place to which we attached no importance not one of the staff officers knew the location of Nomonhan. So after making a report of the matter to the Commander of the Army, we went to headquarters, and although we ordered the intelligence section of the staff department to bring a map of the Hailar district, as well as ordering investigations to be made by the chief of topography, it was not easy to locate the place. At last after several hours we found a place called "Nomonhan Buru", and deciding that this must be the place, began to study countermeasures.

"In such circumstances no action on the part of the Commander of the Army could be taken that day, and it was on the following day, the 14th, that after consultations between the commander and his staff necessary measures were taken. Such measures were to telegraph the commander of the 23d Division to the effect that the Commander of the Kwantung 'rmy agreed with him in his decision, but that in the settlement of the incident we could not permit the crossing of the border from our side, and to take the

rost extreme caution not to let the matter become enlarged." THE PRESIDENT: "e will recess now for fifteen minutes. (Thereupon, st 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) 11. 

Duda & Leftler

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to put one or two additional questions to the witness.

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Wr. Witness, at the meeting which you have testified to on the 14th of May between the Commander of the Kwantung Army and his staff, was a decision reached as to what action should be taken?

- A Yes, a decision was made.
- Q What was that decision?

A It was decided in accordance with his natural authority, the commander of the Hailar Defense Force -- correction: One of the decisions made was to dispatch one unit to Nomonhan, agreeing to the natural authority vested in the commander of the Hailar Defense Force.

Correction: One of the decisions was that the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army agreed to the sending of a unit to Nomonhan in accordance with the natural -- decided upon by the commander of the Hailar befense Force in accordance with the authority vested in him. Another point in the decision, that in dispatching this unit, the Japanese were absolutely not to cross the border.

Another decision was to the effect that no activities should be undertaken such as would expand the incident; and also to send a telegram containing the three-point decision to the commander of the Hailar Defense Force.

MR. BLAKENEY: You may cross-examine.

MR. TAVENNER: The prosecution does not desire to cross-examine.

MR. BLAKENEY: I request that the witness be released on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is released accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: The testimony of Lieutenant General HASHIMOTO, Gun, exhibits 2621 and 2622, is here referred to for convenience in its bearing on the point here under consideration.

I now call as a witness to testify concerning some aspects of the Nomonhan Incident, OGISU, Rippei, whose affidavit is defense document No. 1376.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, this document, 1376, and also defense document 1581, slightly below it, are afficavits which were served during the noon recess and the prosecution does not waive the ruling of the Tribunal with regard to it.

MR. BLAKENEY: Again, I say I am at a loss to know just what the prosecution does propose. I do not believe that I should be compelled to present other parts of the case which have no logical connection with those already presented, and I think if the prosecution is not ready to cross-examine they should request time to prepare for that purpose.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if the prosecution insist, we won't take this evidence until tomorrow afternoon.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I am not prepared to proceed because I would have to rewrite my commentary, I will have to rearrange my documents, try to bring them into some other order.

THE PRESIDENT: We don't want to waste fifty minutes by adjourning until tomorrow. Or would it be until tomorrow afternoon?

MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, we are willing to make every reasonable concession in view of the manner in which -- the sudden manner in which this matter came up today. I think by tomorrow morning we would be perfectly willing to waive any residue of the twenty-four hour notice that is required.

THE PRESIDENT: If we adjourn now we lose forty-five precious minutes.

1 2

MR. TAVENNER: There are eighty-three documents on this order list, only a half dozen or so of which have been called. But if defense counsel feels that it will be a great interruption to call other documents, there would be no objection on our part to the reading of the affidavits provided that we have until tomorrow morning to do the cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: We appreciate your sensible attitude, Mr. Tavenner.

RIPPEI OGISU, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first only sworn, 2 testified through Japanese interpreters as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. BLAKENEY: State your name and residence, please, Mr. Witness. My name, OGISU, Rippei. My address, 1777 9 Uehara-cho, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo. 10 I ask that the witness be handed defense 11 document No. 1376, and I ask the witness to examine 12 this document and state to the Tribunal whether it is 13 his afficavit signed and sealed by him? 14 A This is my afficavit. 15 Q Are the contents thereof true and correct? 16 17 A There are no errors. MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit, defense document 13 19 No. 1376, is offered in evidence. 20 21

22

23

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: We object to paragraph 2. In paragraph 1, the witness states that he arrived in the district on the 2nd of August, 1939, and in paragraph 3, he states that he did not arrive at the actual scene until August 12, but in paragraph 2 he purports to narrate a history of matters which had been occurring before either of those dates. We realize that the Tribunal has relaxed the hearsay rule, but in our submission that means no more than that a witness who states the source of his information is entitled to give that information as evidence. We can then test it both on the question, why the informant is not available and as to the credibility of the informant as well as the witness. But, in our submission that relaxation does not entitle a witness to convert himself into a narrator of an event which he admittedly knows nothing about. We have noticed an increasing tendency in this direction among recent affidavits, and we ask for a ruling of the Tribunal so that it may be stopped.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we have arrived at no particular ruling about hearsay except we do not exclude it, but I know what my colleagues think about that; they do expect to be told the source of the

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23 24

information. But we do expect the hearsay to be something which was told to the particular deponent in the course of his duty, and we expect the informant to be a person who is entitled to speak. I cannot put the position any better than has been put for me by one of my colleagues as this debate has proceeded, namely, as commander in chief of the army -- he is a lieutenant general -- he would get frequent reports and thus should know, as far as the reports went, whether they were truthful and what the position was. There may be other safeguards; for the moment, I cannot think of any. You might get out of him, as you examine him in chief, Major Blakeney, just what was the source of his information, and what duty he had to acquire it.

MR. COMYNS CARH: Your Honor, in this case my objection is to matters which occurred before he became commander.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, of course, so far as he testifies as to the opinion of any particular country, we will want to know on what that opinion was based also. He testifies as to the settled opinion of Manchukuo, which is a government. It certainly will not be of much help to us unless we know upon what grounds the Manchukuoan opinion was

7 8

based. The most biased authority of all as to the boundaries concerned would be one of the two governments concerned.

MR. BLAKENEY: That is what I was going to suggest, that all of these matters can very effect-ively and properly be disposed of on cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: My colleagues direct my attention to the last three lines of paragraph 2:

"The armed clash occured as the Outer Mongolian soldiers made an assault against the aforesaid Mongolian frontier guards on the Manchurian side on May 12 of the same year."

In that, my colleagues point out, the witness attempts to pre-judge the issue, although he was not there.

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes. Recognizing that that is the type of evidence which became very familiar to us during the prosecution's Russian phase, I did propose to ask him additional questions on direct examination to attempt to get facts in place of conclusions.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, proceed to read the affidavit.

MR. BLAKENEY: It has not yet been given an

exhibit number, I believe.

CLIRK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1376 will receive exhibit No. 2656.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2656 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: The affidavit is as follows, omitting the formal parts:

"I am a former lieutenant-general in the Japanese army. During the interval between August to October of 1939 I participated in the Nomanhan Affair as the commander of the Six Army which was under the command of the Kwantung Army.

"1. It was August 2, 1939 that I as the commander of the Six Army arrived at Hailar. I encountered then an affair which was later on known as the 'Nomanhan Affair' already broken out. The Six Army had under its command the 23rd Division, part of the 7th Division and a frontier garrison.

"2. It was a settled opinion on the part of Manchukuo since its national inception that the frontier line between Manchukuo and Outer Mongolia was a line along the River Halha. The frontier observation post of Manchukuo was located at Noman-chan, a little over 10 kilometers back off the Halha.

15.0

5.

10.

It is a common practice to set a frontier guard post at a spot a little removed from the border line of any two countries. Moreover, the east bank of the River Halha is law land and was therefore, unfit for the site of a frontier guard post. The aforesaid guard post at Nomanhan was composed of Mongolian (Inner) soldiers who were to keep watch at the frontier of the Manchurian side. The Outer Mongolian side had its pickets disposed along the left bank: of the River Halha. The armed clash occurred as the Outer Mongolian soldiers made an assault against the aforesaid Mongolian frontier guards on the Manchurian side on May 12 of the same year.

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

145

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Kapleau Wolf

"3. I arrived at Nomanhan on August 12, 1939, and, on the following 13th, reached the spot where the fighting was taking place. I took a general view of the actual situation with our side facing the opponents across the River Halha and right away ordered the commander of the 23rd Division to quickly concentrate forces for winter-encampment. Then I returned to Hailar. At Hailar I was keeping myself busy in making an inspection visit of the guard when on the 20th of the same month an aerial message was brought in, which said that united forces of Outer Mongolians and Soviets with tank units as their major strength had made inroad into the Manchurian territory along seven separate roads. I despatched the chief of the staff to the battle-ground the next day (21st) and I myself reached there on the 23rd and endeavored to check their advances. In September 1" -- I suppose -- "we found them building defence positions along the line from the River Harbin-Goal to Nomanhan. On teptember 6 we received an Imperial Command from Headquarters ordering the 6th Army to make an agreement for the cessation of hostilities holding the positions on both sides as they were. Consequently, I sent the chief of staff as my representative to the Foviet position, and the

2

3

4

6

8

9

10.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

cessation of hostilities was concluded.

"4. My duty at that time was to guard the frontier line. No order had we received from either the Kwantung Army or the Headquarters to advance forward by crossing the frontier line. The duty of the 23rd Division prior to my installation in the rost of commander of the 6th Army was also to guard the frontier line."

BY MR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q Now, Mr Witness, I wish to ask you a few additional questions. When you arrived at Hailar on the 2nd of August, 1939 to assume your post as Commander of the 6th Army, were you given information by the staff officers of your army concerning the situation?

A I arrived at Hailar on August 12th.

MR. BLAKENEY: I am told, if the Tribunal please, that that appears as the 12th in the Japanese version of the affidavit and is therefore a misprint 20 here.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that agreed? If it is 21 22 hot, we will refer it to the Language Section.

Then, correcting my question in that way, 24 Mr. Witness, when you arrived at Hailar on the 12th 25 of August as Commander of the 6th Army were you

informed by the staff officers of your army of the situation then existing?

A Yes.

Q Were they reporting to you in their official capacity as your staff officers and to you in your official capacity as Commander of the 6th Army?

A Yes.

Q And did they, in making this report, officially state to you what was known of the origin and cause of the incident prior to your arrival?

A Not only my staff officers, but I heard directly from the Commander of the 23rd Division in the field of battle on the following day, the 13th, as to the origin and the cause of the incident.

Q And was it on the basis of those official reports so made to you that you made your decisions and issued your orders for the further management of the incident?

A That is so.

Q Is it on the basis of those official reports and other reports received by you from time to time and of any official files which appertain to you as Commander of the 6th Army that you make the statements contained in your affidavit concerning the origin and outbreak of the Nomanhan Incident?

A Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYN: CARR: Your Honor, I was hoping to get an opportunity to object before the witness was allowed to answer. In every question put my friend has been extremely leading, but the last one, in my submission, is beyond all limits.

MR. BLAKENEY: I detect in it none of the elements of an improper, leading question.

THE PRESIDENT: That is a question that suggests the answer and is right on the borderline, Major. You might have asked him on what he based what he said in his affidavit.

WR. BLAKENEY: Since he has answered, I will pass on to another matter.

BY UR. BLAKENEY (Continued):

Q Did you or did you not credit or believe the report so made to you by your staff officers and others?

A Yes, I believed them.

Q Who was the Commander of the 23rd Division at that time?

A Lieutenant General KAMAT: UBARA.

Q Is he alive or dead?

A He died after returning to Japan as a result

-

10

12

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

13 14

15 16

17

19

20

21

23

F)

24

25

1 of an illness. 2 Q Do you know who was the Chief of Staff 3 of the 23rd Division? 4 A I do not recall. 5 Q Can tell us who was Commander of the part 6 of the 7th Division which was in the area at that 7 time? 8 A I have forgotten. 9 Q Did yourself at any time see what was 10 reported to you by your staff or subordinate officers 11 to have been the original Manchukuoan guard post 12 at Nomanhan? 13 A On the 13th I arrived on the spot and heard 14 the general report of the situation from the Commander 15 of the 23rd Division and other officers attached to 16 that division. 17 Q At that time were the original Manchukuoan 18 border-guard posts pointed out to you? 19 A I have seen the areas through which I passed 20 in the vicinity of Nomanhan. 21 Q I am afraid I don't quite understand. Do 22 you mean that you saw them at that time? 23

A Yes, they were pointed out and I think

two or three such points were indicated to me.

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18:

19

21

22

23

24

O You have testified concerning the duties of the 23rd Division prior to your arrival on the scene. How do you come into possession of that information?

A I have stated those aspects of the report which were made to me at the time by the Commander of the 23rd Division.

O One last question: Who was your Chief of Staff in the 6th Army?

A Major-General FUGIMOTO.

O Is he still alive?

A He was in the southern regions somewhere, but I don't know of him since his going into that area.

MR. BLAKENEY: That concludes the direct examination. Will his cross-examination belieserved?

I understand that cross-examination will proceed; but may I suggest, in accordance with the requirements which have been enforced in the past, that counsel who objected originally to the affidavits conduct the cross-examination?

THE PRESIDENT: Major Moore.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): Mr. President, in the present exhibit, paragraph 1, line 1, the date should be August 12.

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

11

12

13

15

18

19

21 22

24

15

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Major.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, we would

like to start cross-examination now in order to save time.

THE PRESIDENT: Proceed, Colonel Smirnov.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV:

Mr. Witness, at what date precisely did you arrive at the disposition of the 6th Army -- the place of disposition of the 6th Army?

A It was on the 12th that I arrived. The concentration of the 6th Army and my arrival at Hailar -- my post at Hailar took place on the 12th -- the 13th; but at that time the 6th Army had not completed its concentration. At that time the 23rd Division and the 27th Division, which constituted the first line forces of the 6th Army, were in the Namanhan area.

THE MONITOR: "27th Division" should be corrected to read "a part of the 7th Division."

A (Continuing) And it was on the 13th that I arrived at the Division Meadquarters on the front lines.

Are you sure you arrived at the place of disposition of the 6th Army only on the 12th of

August 1939?

A Yes.

But on August 10, 1939, didn't you issue a special declaration addressed to the newly formed 6th Army?

A I do not know. I do not know the date of the organization of the 6th Army. My order to take over the post of the Commander of the 6th Army was received by me on August 1.

O Did you personally issue any declaration addressed to the units of the 6th Army?

A I do not understand the question. I don't think I issued any particularly formal statement.

O Didn't you issue an address in which you stated that the main purpose of the 6th Army was that each should complete its task in the Nomanhan area?

A The duty of the 6th Army was to continue the duty which was undertaken by the 23rd Division, that is, guarding -- that is, to guard the border. That was my belief.

I ask you to make an effort to try to remember the course of events as it was at that time.

Did not you issue special address to the units of the army in which you stated that the

2

1

4 5

6

7·

0

9

10.

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22.

25

24

events in which the army had participated exceeded the limits of the -- exceeded the limits of a border incident?

A. No.

o I will try to refresh your memory. Didn't you say in a special statement addressed to the army units that the army -- and which was signed by you, that the army was thrown into the whirlpool -- into a whirlpool of unorderly fighting in the Nomanhan area on the border between Mongolia and Manchuria?

A I do not know. I have no recollection.

You don't remember it or you refuse that you did issue this statement?

THE PRESIDENT: He says he doesn't remember.

A I cannot understand the real purport of the question. It is entirely unclear to me.

THE PRESIDENT: The English version appeared unclear to me too. I think you had better put the question again, Colonel.

I asked you: Did you not issue on September 5 a special address entitled "A Proclamation by the Commander of the 6th Army"?

A I don't think so.

O Then, I ask you whether this proclamation contained the two following sentences: First:

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

14

15 16

17

19

20

21

22

24

13 .

"The state of affairs is such that we went beyond the limits of a simple border incident"; and second: "The army was thrown into a whirlpool of unorderly fighting on the Mongolian-Manchurian border."

THE PRESIDENT: "Disorderly" is the word.

A On the 6th of September an order in the name of the Imperial Command came from the Imperial General Headquarters to cease fighting, and this being the day, that is, September 5 -- it being the day before the arrival of that order -- such an Imperial Command order having been received on the 6th of September, I don't think there was any opportunity to give such instructions on the 5th of September, that is, the day before.

THE PRESIDENT: "e will adjourn until halfpast nine tomerrown morning.

("Thereupon, at 1600, a recess was taken until Tuesday, the 27th of May, at 0930.)